This report has been replaced by QR-26-00138 — a newer version of the product was reviewed.



VIBE96 QUALITY REPORT

ApparelOS – Garment ERP Software: Factory Management System (Production, Inventory, HR & Payroll, Accounts)

Garment ERP software for apparel factories — order management, production planning, inventory, HR & payroll, double-entr

Product ID	**B0365-58871**
Builder	**NexStep Digital**
Version reviewed	**1.19.0 · released 6 Nov 2026**
Stack	**Laravel 13 (laravel/framework ~13.37) · PHP 8.3 · MySQL 8**
Built with	**Claude Code**
Review period	**5 Nov 2026 – 6 Nov 2026**

81 / 100

Passed with 4 warnings

Pass mark 75 and no failing check.

Scores

Security	82
Code structure	78
Docs & completeness	80
Dependency health	82
Build & deploy	80

✓ **AI code audit**
6 checks · 5 Nov 2026

✓ **Installed & run**
6 Nov 2026

✓ **Demo vs delivered**
6 Nov 2026

✓ **Final sign-off**
6 Nov 2026

At a glance

! Installed and run from the delivered code — 7 of 8 checks answered yes.

✓ Live demo compared with the delivered code — 7 of 7 checks answered yes.

! 12 of 15 promised items delivered (setup guide, example config and the rest).

✓ Security scored 82/100 with no failing check.

! 4 open warnings — explained in part 1.

Check this report is genuine. Scan the code or open vibe96.com/report/QR-26-00101. The online copy always shows the latest status.

PART 1

AI code audit

The full source archive was read by our AI auditor against each check. It reads the code — it does not run it; running it is part 2.

CHECK	WHAT WE FOUND	SCORE	RESULT
Secrets & credentials	All secret-scan candidates are env-var lookups, validation rules, test fixtures or documentation placeholders. docker-compose.yml requires DB passwords from .env with no default, and setup.sh reads the admin password from the environment. The only caveats are the XSRF cookie on the live demo (normal Laravel behaviour) and the one-click demo login, which should be confirmed as disabled in production.	92	Pass
Dependency vulnerabilities	composer.json uses bounded caret ranges with no wildcards, and composer.lock (313 KB) plus a composer-audit.txt are committed. The lockfile contents and audit output were not included in the digest, so installed versions cannot be checked against advisories; a few hygiene gaps remain.	82	Pass
Authorisation & access control	Visible route groups in phase2a/2b carry auth and module-role middleware, and passwords are hashed via validated rules. However, the accounting-period close/open admin routes cannot be confirmed to have role:admin (the comment says a project file enforces it, but that file was not shown), the one-click demo login bypasses passwords, and the digest was truncated so [hidden]/2d, the API token endpoints and ownership checks could not be verified	72	Warning
Database access rules	The visible database code (AccountingPeriodController) uses Eloquent with validated input and a transaction with a duplicate-key fallback, and no string-built SQL appeared in the digest. However, only a fraction of the 1043 files were provided, so the migrations, models and raw-query usage in other controllers could not be verified. A confidence deduction applies until those are reviewed.	82	Warning
Code structure & duplication	Controllers, requests and the accounting-period controller are reasonably sized and delegate to config and validation rules. The main costs are the same password policy hard-coded in three places, route files split by build phase rather than by module, and audit-round references left in production code comments.	78	Warning
Build reproducibility	composer.json, composer.lock and the docker-compose file are coherent: PHP 8.3 and Laravel ^13.37 match across the manifest and docs, and DB passwords are required with no defaults. HowToSetup.md, setup.sh, INSTALL.md and .env.example were not in the digest, so step order and database creation could not be confirmed. A few small inconsistencies remain in the Docker and composer scripts.	80	Warning

Open warnings

Problems that did not stop the listing. They stay on the product page until a later version fixes them.

Warning 1 **Build looks mostly reproducible; setup document and several files could not be verified**

composer.json, composer.lock and the docker-compose file are coherent: PHP 8.3 and Laravel ^13.37 match across the manifest and docs, and DB passwords are required with no defaults. HowToSetup.md, setup.sh, INSTALL.md and .env.example were not in the digest, so step order and database creation could not be confirmed. A few small inconsistencies remain in the Docker and composer scripts.

Warning 2 **No injection or unscoped deletes seen; migration and most models not visible, so schema coverage is unverified**

The visible database code (AccountingPeriodController) uses Eloquent with validated input and a transaction with a duplicate-key fallback, and no string-built SQL appeared in the digest. However, only a fraction of the 1043 files were provided, so the migrations, models and raw-query usage in other controllers could not be verified. A confidence deduction applies until those are reviewed.

Warning 3 **Structure is mostly sound; password policy is duplicated and route and comment conventions are inconsistent**

Controllers, requests and the accounting-period controller are reasonably sized and delegate to config and validation rules. The main costs are the same password policy hard-coded in three places, route files split by build phase rather than by module, and audit-round references left in production code comments.

Warning 4 **Routes mostly guarded by auth+role; admin check and demo login not verifiable, no ownership checks visible**

Visible route groups in phase2a/2b carry auth and module-role middleware, and passwords are hashed via validated rules. However, the accounting-period close/open admin routes cannot be confirmed to have role:admin (the comment says a project file enforces it, but that file was not shown), the one-click demo login bypasses passwords, and the digest was truncated so [hidden]/2d, the API token endpoints and ownership checks could not be verified

Requirement list

What the builder agreed to deliver before uploading — 12 of 15 met.

✓	Complete source for every component	Met
✓	No real credentials in the archive	Met
✓	Builds from a clean machine	Met
✓	Database script or migrations	Met
!	Authentication and roles on every mutating endpoint	Partial
!	Pinned dependencies without critical CVEs (nice)	Partial
✓	Documentation set (nice)	Met
!	Working live demo	Partial
✓	README.md	Met
✓	HowToSetup.md	Met
✓	CLAUDE.md (or AGENTS.md) (nice)	Met
✓	CHANGELOG.md (nice)	Met
✓	.env.example	Met
✓	a project file	Met
✓	a project file (nice)	Met

PART 2

Human review

Reviewers from the Vibe96 team in Dubai worked through each question below; a final reviewer signed it off.

Stage 1 — Installed and run from the delivered code

Completed 6 Nov 2026

A reviewer installed the product on a clean machine, following only the guide that ships with it.

QUESTION	ANSWER	REVIEWER'S NOTE
Packages restored without errors	Yes	
Solution builds clean	Yes	
Database created from the shipped script or migrations	Yes	
First sign-in works with the documented steps	Yes	
Setup guide is accurate and complete	Yes	
Every module in the feature list opens and works	Yes	
No real secrets in the archive	Yes	
Branding and company details can be changed without code	No	

Stage 2 — Live demo compared with the delivered code

Completed 6 Nov 2026

A second reviewer checked that what the listing and demo show is what the buyer receives.

QUESTION	ANSWER	REVIEWER'S NOTE
Demo URL is reachable	Yes	
Demo credentials work	Yes	
Demo runs the same version as the archive	Yes	
All five differentiators are visible in the demo	Yes	
Screenshots match the demo	Yes	
Nothing in the demo is missing from the code	Yes	
Datasheet claims are accurate	Yes	

Changes asked for during review

None — approved on the first round.

Sign-off: approved for sale on 6 Nov 2026 with 4 warnings shown publicly.

What this report covers — and what it doesn't

- **It covers** version 1.19.0 exactly as the buyer downloads it: the source archive, the setup guide and the live demo on the dates above.

- **It is not** a penetration test, a performance or load test, or a legal review of third-party package licences.
- **Scores are a point in time.** Libraries age; a later version is audited again and gets its own report.
- **Your setup matters.** Hosting, configuration and changes made after purchase are outside this review.
- **How the score is made:** each AI check is scored 0–100 and weighted (security counts most). A listing needs 75 or more, no failing check, and the human review passed.
- **Always try the live demo** before buying, and ask the builder questions from the product page.

Report history

REPORT	VERSION	DATE	SCORE	STATUS
QR-26-00138	1.20.2	16 Nov 2026	**80**	Current
QR-26-00101	1.19.0	6 Nov 2026	**81**	Replaced
QR-26-00090	1.0.0	4 Nov 2026	**73**	Replaced